

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 8, and 15.

Objections

The Specification is objected to by the Examiner for containing missing elements. Specifically, the Specification is objected to for missing the application serial numbers and filing dates of the related applications. The Specification has been amended by this reply to insert the missing elements. No new subject matter is added by way of these amendments. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Drawings

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to indicate whether the drawings filed on July 16, 2003, are acceptable.

Claim Amendments

The claims have been amended to clarify the present invention as recited. Specifically, independent claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended to recite that the unique identifier identifies said configuration information specific to the client device. Further, independent claim 8 has been amended to recite that the portal server stores the configuration information specific to the client device.

Support for these amendments may be found, for example, beginning on page 13, line 20 of the Specification. No new subject matter is added by way of these amendments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 15-20 recite a computer readable medium. Applicants respectfully assert that there is sufficient enablement for a computer readable medium in the Specification of Application Serial No. 10/622,158, which is incorporated by reference into the present application. Specifically, enabling detail for these claims may be found, for example, in at least Figure 3, on pages 13-16, and in the originally filed claims of the Specification of Application Serial No. 10/622,158. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-11 and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Publication No. 2002/0103935 (“Fishman”). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, independent claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended to recite that the unique identifier identifies configuration information specific to the client device. Specifically, the claimed invention now recites that the mapping of the client value to the unique identifier permits the identification of configuration information specific to the client device.

Turning to the rejection of the claims, for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any

feature not directly taught must be inherently present. *See* MPEP § 2131. The Applicants respectfully assert that Fishman does not disclose *mapping a client value to a unique identifier*, wherein the unique identifier identifies configuration information specific to the client device, as recited in the amended independent claims.

In particular, the cited portion of Fishman discloses “when mobile gateway receives content for a mobile client, mobile client data identifies the type of mobile client that will receive the content and the transform associated with that mobile client.” *See* Fishman, paragraph [0035], lines 10-12. However, Fishman fails to disclose that the portal server stores a mapping of a client value to a unique identifier, which identifies configuration information specific to the client device. In fact, the only client value associated with a client device that is disclosed by Fishman is a transform value (*i.e.*, transform A, transform B, transform C disclosed in Figure 2 and the accompanying text of Fishman). While the transform values disclosed in Fishman may be based on operating characteristics of the client device, Fishman fails to disclose that the transform value is *mapped* to a unique identifier that identifies configuration information of a specific client device.

In particular, the Examiner refers to the cited portion of Fishman (*i.e.*, paragraph [0035], lines 10-12) and asserts “where identifying the client with associated data *means* mapping the content to the client device” (*see* Office Action mailed March 27, 2007, page 3). Clearly, identifying data associated with the client is *not* equivalent to mapping a client value of a client device to a unique identifier, which identifies configuration information specific to the client device. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that identifying client data for a client device constitutes a mapping, Fishman still fails to disclose a *unique identifier* that identifies configuration information of the client to which the client value is mapped. Neither content nor the client device is equivalent to a unique identifier as recited in the claimed invention.

In view of the above, it is clear that amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are patentable over Fishman. Further, dependent claims 2-7, 9-11, and 16-20 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fishman in view of US Publication No. 2003/0065623 (“Corneil”). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Fishman fails to teach or suggest the limitations of independent claim 8. Further, Corneil fails to supply that which Fishman lacks, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Corneil solely for the purpose of teaching a firewall coupled to the portal server and a wireless access point coupled to the firewall (*see* Office Action mailed March 27, 2007, pages 6-7).

In view of the above, it is clear that independent claim 8 is patentable over Fishman and Corneil, whether considered separately or in combination. Furthermore, dependent claims 12-14 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226.506001).

Dated: July 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/

Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant